Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Mr. Tolson

DATE: 5/7/56

FROM: L. B. Nichols

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED DATE 10-30-90 BY [redacted]

SUBJECT: JESUS DE GALINDEZ
MISSING PERSON-INFORMATION CONCERNING

With reference to Olney's memorandum of 5/3/56, and our reply of 5/4/56, I desire to advise that I delivered to William Rogers his copy of our memorandum to the Attorney General. I told Rogers of the background of this. He asked if I had a copy of Olney's memorandum of May 3. I did have the copy that Olney sent to me. I told Rogers that Olney had called me late Thursday and wanted to see me in the morning. I told him I had an outside appointment. He then asked that I call him when I came in. I told Rogers that prior to my being able to call Olney, Olney had called me; that within approximately a half hour I had returned the call and Olney was out. In the meantime, Olney had sent the memorandum to the Bureau.

I reminded Rogers of the 2/6/56, memorandum which he had recalled. I told Rogers that Olney's reference to this memorandum now put us in a rather untenable position and made us wonder whether we were doing the right thing in trying to play square with the Department when Olney would turn around after the 2/6/56, memorandum had been recalled and then refer to it and that we were undecided as to whether we should go ahead and answer the 2/6/56, memorandum at this time. Rogers stated that there was no need to do this; that Olney should not have written his 5/3/56, memorandum; that he could not understand why people would do such things. I told Rogers that as he would see in the memorandum of 5/4/56, we were putting the matter squarely up to the Attorney General; that we, of course, were willing to go out and investigate the Damman, Hartley and De Galindez cases but we were not going to do it until the Attorney General had specifically said so because of the involvements and ramifications and that we had succeeded in keeping the responsibility of these three cases not only away from the Bureau but away from the Department; that in the De Galindez case, there were international ramifications and if the Attorney General wanted to invite additional headaches, then, of course, that was his prerogative and that the matter was squarely up to the Department although we felt rather badly over the manner in which we were being treated and we simply could not reconcile Olney's memorandum of 5/3/56, with the results of the conference in the Attorney General's Office on 4/26/56, and that if Olney had

cc - Mr. Boardman
Mr. Belmont
Mr. Rosen

LBN:[illegible]

65-317-[illegible]
NOT RECORDED
102 MAY 16 1956

MAY 9 1956

MAY 25 1956

any question about the propriety of our position then the facts were first called to his attention by our memorandum of 4/23/56, and that we frankly did not know whether Olney was trying to jam the Bureau, the Attorney General or both and that we wanted it clearly understood that if the Attorney General ordered us to make these investigations that the Attorney General knew in advance exactly what he was getting into.

Rogers agreed and asked me to leave a copy of Olney's memorandum of 5/3/56, which I did along with Rogers' copy of our memorandum to the Attorney General. I specifically asked Rogers if we would hear further from him on this and he stated that we would.

K

During phone conv another memo has been received from Olney making the situation even worse.

K